

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES OF WORK SESSION
September 1, 1994

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgkin

Reed Hodgkin called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. There was an introduction of Board members, staff and visitors present, and discussion of ground rules for meeting.

Board/Ex-Officio members present: Alan Aluisi, Gale Biggs, Jim Burch, Lloyd Casey, Chuck Clark, Ralph Coleman, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Gislinde Engelmann, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Jack Kraushaar, LeRoy Moore, Linda Murakami, David Navarro, Joe Tempel, Gary Thompson, Beverly Lyne Wilber, Dave Brockman, Steve Tarlton

Board/Ex-Officio members absent: Lorraine Anderson, Stuart Asay, Jan Burda, Albert Lambert, Richard Seebass, Reginald Thomas, Martin Hestmark, Leanne Smith

Public/observers present: LizBeth Cone (ASG); John Ensign (citizen); T.E. DuPont (citizen); Sheila Little (Fluor Daniel); Jim Stone (RFCC); Joe Rippetoe (citizen); Jack Krupansky (citizen); E. Simmons (ICF Kaiser); Bill Root (ICF Kaiser); Cheryl Arnold (WSI); Tod Anderson (DOE); DeAnne Butterfield (RFLII); Greg Marsh (RFCC); Ron Backshall (citizen); Pat McCrohan (citizen); Kathaleen Bechard (DOE); Teresa Mikulsky (EG&G); Joelle Klein (DOE); Dave Simonson (DOE); Scott Hansen (student); Sujit Gupta (EG&G); Dave Holton (citizen); Charlene Ostuni (student); Kasey Fahlsing (student); Amy Abeyta (student); Stefanie Bell (citizen); Jeanie Sedgely (RFLII); Warren Howard (U.S. Dept. of Labor); Jeff Munson (Broomfield Enterprise); Margaret Mortz (citizen)

PRESENTATION: Strategic Plan

Joe Wienand - DOE, Planning & Integration, gave a presentation on the Rocky Flats ETS Strategic Plan. The purpose of the presentation was to familiarize the Board with the Strategic Plan, and help to improve communications between Board and DOE. DOE believes the Strategic Plan provides a way to communicate with public and workers on-site regarding the vision, mission, goals, objectives and strategies for the RFETS. A public comment period on the Strategic Plan has just closed, and the plan will be restructured based on some of the comments received.

The mission statement was developed in 1992 between the parties involved, and a consensus was achieved on one common mission for the site. DOE is currently in the process of revising the Strategic Plan through the end of September, and plans to issue the first Strategic Plan on September 30. This plan will be effective for one year, and DOE then plans to update the plan before September of next year.

One strategic objective involves the management of nuclear materials - including the consolidation of special nuclear materials into one building on-site, in preparation for its eventual removal from the site. There is a work breakdown structure for achieving the goals and objectives based on the mission statement and on what is contained in the Strategic Plan, and funding is allocated based on that structure. The first integration of this system will be in Fiscal Year 1997. DOE suggests the CAB review the Strategic Plan during the January 1995 time period - by that time the new prioritization methodology should be in place and working. In April 1995 the budget will be submitted, and a review and feedback will be requested at that time as to the CAB's view of how the budget has been prioritized.

DISCUSSION - CONTRACTOR CHANGES:

The CAB took some time to discuss Fluor Daniels' buyout of the EG&G contract to manage the Rocky Flats site just prior to the approval of a new contractor. Some members felt that the change would be positive. Others expressed serious concerns about Fluor Daniels taking over the contract. Board members were asked to submit additional questions to staff (Ken), who will forward them to Dave Simonson for response.

ADMIN RECORD

Recommendation: David Navarro recommended that DOE sponsor a public meeting regarding the contractor change, and that DOE hold its decision on approval of the buyout in abeyance until there is adequate time to hold such a meeting.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED. Staff will draft letter to DOE requesting meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

1) EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- **Recommendation:** Policy regarding Board Member Replacement. Several concerns were addressed on the wording, including: (1) the lack of a category for "resident" or "citizen;" (2) timeline for replacement and specific methods for carrying out replacement; (3) what is the ideal number of members on the Board; (4) possibly establishing a Nominating Committee to oversee replacement.

Action: Motion to refer back to Executive Committee to rewrite policy. APPROVED.

2) SITE WIDE ISSUES COMMITTEE

- The committee is in the process of reviewing documents on both the Site Wide EIS and the Plutonium Vulnerability Assessment. The committee has no recommendations at this time, but hopes to have recommendations on both documents for the next Board meeting.

3) COMMUNITY OUTREACH COMMITTEE

- **Recommendation:** Approve proposal for Citizens Guide to the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement. Add phrase that the Citizens Guide will be approved by the Board before publication.

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.

4) ENVIRONMENTAL/WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

- Discussed at its last meeting the request by Board members to be responsive to the new contractor process. Board members are requested to give input through committee meetings. Jim Burch requested that Board members fill out and return questionnaire on new contractor as distributed previously to Board.
 - The committee had a presentation on the Rocky Flats Cleanup Agreement at its last meeting. Ken Korkia will forward comments on the RFCA to DOE.
 - Requested a tour of solar pond area to help in its recommendation to Board on status of closure of solar ponds, and will research AEC requirements on closure.
 - Committee hopes to develop a scope of work so that it may be more proactive.
 - **Recommendation:** Approve nomination of Tom Gallegos as co-chair of committee.
- Action:** Motion to accept. APPROVED.

5) ALTERNATIVE USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

- **Recommendation:** Approve Change of Status of Committee to Ad-Hoc.
- Action:** Motion to accept. APPROVED.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOARD RETREAT:

1) CONSENSUS DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

- **Recommendation:** Approve CAB Consensus Decision-Making Process. Suggested that the title be changed from "process" to "guidelines," and that lines on flow chart be added to bypass some areas if there are no objections during the consensus process.
- Action:** Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.

2) CAB "AGENDA" PURPOSE

- The draft "Agenda" or "Focus" Related to Cleanup was discussed by the Board. It was suggested that this simply duplicates the CAB mission statement already approved, and is unnecessary. The Board members decided to not to proceed with voting on this draft and to set it aside.

3) REPRESENTATIONAL ISSUES/POLICY

- **Recommendation:** Approve Items I. and II. of CAB Representational Policy. Item III. will be discussed in further detail at a later date.
Action: Motion to accept both Items I. and II. APPROVED.

OTHER ISSUES RAISED:

- Linda Murakami and the Board members thanked Joe Tempel for his service on the CAB. Joe Tempel has resigned from the Board, and this is his last meeting.
- DOE has offered to bring in instructors to conduct a two-day educational workshop on environmental laws and regulations, i.e., CERCLA, RCRA, Clean Air and Water Acts. This is a 16-hour course, all day Friday and Saturday. The preferred dates for holding the session are 11/4 and 11/5. There was interest among Board and visitors present for both the two full days and one full day of training, with sessions videotaped for those who are unable to attend.

SET TIME AND AGENDA FOR BOARD RETREAT:

- Board Retreat date set for Sunday, November 20, 1994.
- Tentative topics: conflict of interest, additional representational issues, and consensus training.

EDUCATIONAL BRIEFING SCHEDULE:

Recommendation: Approve Waste Management educational briefing topics/schedule.
Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

DEFERRED ISSUES:

- PNL request
- Alternative use
- Los Alamos technology activities at Rocky Flats:
 - public involvement
 - scope
 - basis for selection
- Citizens board to advise DOE on management at Rocky Flats
- Representational issues - Item III.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: October 6, 1994, 6:30 - 9:30 p.m.
Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room
Agenda:

- A Snapshot of Waste Management at Rocky Flats Today
- Committee Reports

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY:

ASSIGNED TO:

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1) Draft letter to DOE requesting public meeting on new contractor at Rocky Flats | Staff |
| 2) Request from DOE answers to questions posed by Board on new contractor at Rocky Flats | Staff |
| 3) Rewrite Board Member Replacement Policy | Executive Committee |

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:44 P.M.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD TO STRATEGIC PLAN BRIEFING:

- Question:** Are you talking only about paper, when you say 4,000 exchanges?
Answer: No, that is actual identification of where the work will change hands.
- Question:** How is the Strategic Plan integrated with the Cleanup Agreement?
Answer: A new planning tool, the Site Integrated Baseline, will serve as a link between the Strategic Plan and the Cleanup Agreement. This baseline lists what activities will be conducted for a given fiscal year, based on the Strategic Plan. The Cleanup Agreement requires that the baseline be prepared so that the regulators know what activities DOE plans to accomplish each year.
- Question:** One deadline for management of nuclear waste is the year 2000, can't that be managed by 1995?
Answer: The actual management of material - consolidation into one building - the target date is sooner than that.
- Question:** Why isn't there one lump sum of funding to share, rather than breakdown of funding?
Answer: This is identified in the work breakdown structure - everybody has to support the objectives to get things done.
- Question:** The Strategic Plan is basically a document to help you get the right amount of money to do what you want to do?
Answer: It's a document that outlines where we want to go so that we can request the right amount of money to achieve it.
- Question:** What would you like to see the CAB as far as giving you input?
Answer: To assist in the budgetary process - look at our priorities. Are the priorities the same as what the communities feel are necessary? This feedback will be requested in January.
- Question:** How will you measure your objectives? For instance, no. 3 - reduce public risk by 50%. That implies that the risks are now unacceptable and a 50% reduction would result in acceptable risk.
Answer: First you do a good assessment of what risks exist now, and then determine what is a reasonable reduction of that risk.
- Question:** Is it true that in this document there are some things that are assumed that may not happen? For instance, putting all special nuclear materials in one building - that's a big assumption and isn't there a lot of homework to do before a final decision, i.e., doing an EIS?
Answer: Yes, in many of these - even though it's a goal - we still have to go through the right process to make that decision. The Strategic Plan is being used in the EIS process as part of our basic planning.
- Question:** In terms of allocating funding to one specific area or another - is some mechanism going to be used now where funds can be transferred again - or are they locked in place?
Answer: We have asked HQ if we can break down the fences between funding - but the budget will be based on priorities put in place.
- Question:** DOE seems hopeful that the nuclear materials could be moved to a site outside Colorado, but that getting such a storage site approved could take 10-20 years. I think we can agree there is no safe site at Rocky Flats for long-term storage. And no plans or money have been appropriated to build a safe storage building at Rocky Flats. Moving all the materials from one unsafe building to another is short-sighted.
Answer: The building that we're looking at - 371 - is the newest building and has all the structural requirements for the interim.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD TO STRATEGIC PLAN BRIEFING:

Question: John Ensign: One comment - you should establish timeframes for when that decision is to be made regardless of what the decision was. Under the Strategic Plan objectives, no. 2 and no. 12 are both waste management - is that a typo or will it be consolidated?

Answer: Yes, it's being consolidated.

Question: John Ensign: Under your supporting strategies 11.1 to 11.5, one thing that's missing is there isn't too much about people. Are issues about the workers addressed under personnel development?

Answer: There are a couple of areas where that's addressed - under worker and public safety, and under personnel development.

Question: Tom DuPont: There are often high level assumptions and restraints - but as time goes on, they can be refined and you can implement them. It might be helpful to take those out of the goals and objectives and put them into a set of assumptions.

Answer: We're trying not to make this document so comprehensive that no one's going to read it.

Question: Tom DuPont: It sounds like this program will be a deviation from the processes going on now. Does the document address a new management structure of any sort to implement this kind of program?

Answer: The document itself doesn't, but the site is structuring itself to address that. The next logical step is to look at our organizations to see how they develop and evolve after the changes.

Question: Dave Holton: Regarding the vision statement - what do you consider economic conversion?

Answer: There are a lot of resources at Rocky Flats that could be used to benefit the local economy - maybe not doing what has been done in the past, but something different. So conversion and making those things economically viable to the local community is what we mean.

Question: Jack Krupansky: Could you describe how you build enough flexibility into the budget so that when 1997 comes around and things have changed, you can adjust?

Answer: The budget process is two years out - but you get to update that again in the next year. Right before the actual budget's fiscal year, we will go through and prioritize again to make sure that what we are doing is still consistent with the plan we had laid out when the budget was originally written.

Question: John Ensign: Cost reductions of 40% of fiscal year 1994 expenditures - how does that relate to the planning and budget process?

Answer: What we're trying to do is reduce costs to just maintaining building and systems where nothing is going on. We're trying to take the money that we spend on that and put it toward things that we need to do - like dealing with liquid plutonium and repackaging.

Question: John Ensign: Would that not be part of the plan - for instance if it ends up in one building - isn't that a part of the original plan?

Answer: You've got to lay out some targets for the year that will force you to do those things.

Comment: John Ensign: I would like to see something address consistency and continuity in management throughout the process - that's what will hold this together.

Comment: Dave Brockman: The 40% reduction in cost - that's a goal.